

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 6-8 and 12-15 are amended. No new matter is added by these amendments. Reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Smith at the interview held January 17, 2008, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

During the course of the personal interview, the Examiner agreed with Applicants' representatives that the above amendments place the application in condition for allowance, as discussed below.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,128,619 to Fogarasi et al. (hereinafter "Fogarasi"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,813,009 to Johnson et al. (hereinafter "Johnson"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Office Action asserts that Fogarasi teaches many of the features as positively recited in the pending claims. However, Fogarasi fails to teach the features as positively recited in amended independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 14. Specifically, Fogarasi cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, document-modification workflow processes, as positively recited in the pending claims. In rejecting the subject matter of the pending claims, the Office Action asserts that Fogarasi teaches processes. The Office Action further asserts that processes are interpreted simply as web browsers displaying the source information from the database. In other words, the Office Action's assertion of processes involves simply the retrieval and display of information. As discussed at least in col. 4, lines

20-35 of Fogarasi, processing involves simply instantiating classes from class definitions, for further display in an Internet enabled application. These processes read input data and generate abstract data structures which are useful in displaying web-based forms, HTML pages, or other web-based documents to a client computer.

In contrast, the subject matter of the pending claims positively recites document-modification workflow processes, which, as discussed on page 6, lines 3-6 of the Applicant's disclosure, and on page 12, lines 3-27, cannot reasonably be considered to correspond to the simple retrieval processes of Fogarasi as discussed above, as Fogarasi teaches only web-based HTML retrieval processes.

Additionally, the Office Action asserts that Fogarasi teaches a storage part which stores the source data, as positively recited in the pending claims. However, this assertion is incorrect. Specifically, the Office Action, at least on page 4, asserts that each of the clients stores at least temporarily source data used in the displaying process, which in the context of the web-based retrieval processing of Fogarasi, consists of temporary storage or caching of data. However, when read in light of the Applicant's specification, the term "storage" is defined to mean storage for recovery from a fault when the fault is generated during execution of service based on the instruction form, as discussed on page 12 of the Applicant's disclosure. Therefore, because storing, in this context is defined in terms of non-temporary, fault recovery storage, and not temporary data caching, Fogarasi cannot reasonably be considered to teach or suggest "storage" as positively recited in the pending claims, and as further defined in light of the Applicant's disclosure. See MPEP §2111.01(IV).

For at least the above reasons, Fogarasi cannot reasonably be considered to teach or suggest the features as positively recited in independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 14. Additionally, claims 2-6, 8-12, 15, 16 and 17 are also allowable at least for their dependence on allowable


independent claims as enumerated above, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-17 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kirk D. Berkheimer
Registration No. 59,874

JAO:ARK/rle

Attachment:
Request for Continued Examination

Date: February 14, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--